UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,055	09/26/2003	Bharat T. Doshi	Doshi 58-10-27-19-36	1226

46850 7590 05/11/2009

MENDELSOHN, DRUCKER, & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
1500 JOHN F. KENNEDY BLVD., SUITE 405
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102

EXAMINER	
HO, CHUONG T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2419	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/673,055	DOSHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHUONG T. HO	2419	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 March 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,8-14 and 18-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,8-14,18 and 19* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *20-24* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *25* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *03/02/09*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment after final rejection filed 03/02/09 have been entered and made of record.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 8-12, 18, 19, 20-22, 24-25 (currently amended claims 20, 24) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. Claims 1-4, 8-12, 18, 19, 20-23, 24-25 (currently amended claims 20, 24) are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 03/02/09 was filed after the mailing date of the Non Final Rejection on 12/09/08. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 20, 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pieds et al. (Patent No.: US 6,882,627 B2) in view of Qiao (Patent No.: US 7,398,321 B2), and in further view of Doshi et al. (U.S.Patent No. 6,130, 875).

As to claim 20, Pieds '627 disclose for each link of a specified set of links in the network: (1) assigning an initial cost to the link (figure 4A, col. 7, lines 1-10, primary path, each links 'L'104, L'102' are assigned a original link cost); determine whether the link's bandwidth can be shared with a new restoration path (col. 2, lines 10-30, determining network resource for one shared risk group).

However, Pieds ' 627 are silent to disclosing reducing the link's assigned initial cost when it is determined that the link's bandwidth can be shared with the new restoration path.

Qiao '321 discloses reducing the link's cost when it is determined that the link's bandwidth (BS1 and BS2) can be shared with the new restoration path (other existing BSs) (col. 12, lines 24 - 26, reduce additional backup bandwidth needed to protect the connection, by allowing BS1 (backup segment) and BS2 to share more backup bandwidth with other existing BSs (besides the fact that BS1 and BS2 can share the backup bandwidth on link c).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply reducing the link's cost when it is determined that the link's bandwidth can be shared with the new restoration path taught by Qiao '321 into the system of Pieds ' 627, since Qiao '321 recited the motivation in the col. 6, lines 22-24

which achieve better bandwidth efficiency than shared path protection while having a much shorter backup segment, as well as a scalable algorithm.

However, the combined system (Pieds ' 627 – Qiao '321) are silent to disclosing calculating the minimum-cost restoration path for the new primary path using the specified set of links, wherein the cost of the minimum-cost restoration path is based on the sum of the cost of the links of the minimum-cost restoration path.

Doshi '875 discloses calculating the minimum-cost restoration path for the new primary path using the specified set of links, wherein the cost of the minimum-cost restoration path is based on the sum of the cost of the links of the minimum-cost restoration path (see figure 16B, step 356, assign demands to two routes with minimum capacity, using the one with least capacity for restoration, col. 30, lines 50-62, step 356, assigned to two routes with minimum capacity, using the route with the least capacity for restoration).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply calculating the minimum-cost restoration path for the new primary path using the specified set of links, wherein the cost of the minimum-cost restoration path is based on the sum of the cost of the links of the minimum-cost restoration path taught by Doshi '875 into the combined system (Pieds ' 627 – Qiao '321), since Doshi '875 recited the motivation in the col. 1, lines 23-25 which restoring communication in a network after a failure in link, span or node of the network, and more particular to restoration techniques in which restoration paths are pre computed at nodes distributed throughout the network.

Regarding to claim 24, Pieds '627 disclose for each link of a specified set of links in the network: (1) assigning an initial cost to the link (figure 4A, col. 7, lines 1-10, primary path, each links 'L'104, L'102' are assigned a original link cost); determine whether the link's bandwidth can be shared with a new restoration path (col. 2, lines 10-30, determining network resource for one shared risk group).

However, Pieds ' 627 are silent to disclosing reducing the link's assigned initial cost when it is determined that the link's bandwidth can be shared with the new restoration path.

Qiao '321 discloses reducing the link's cost when it is determined that the link's bandwidth (BS1 and BS2) can be shared with the new restoration path (other existing BSs) (col. 12, lines 24 - 26, reduce additional backup bandwidth needed to protect the connection, by allowing BS1 (backup segment) and BS2 to share more backup bandwidth with other existing BSs (besides the fact that BS1 and BS2 can share the backup bandwidth on link c).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply reducing the link's cost when it is determined that the link's bandwidth can be shared with the new restoration path taught by Qiao '321 into the system of Pieds ' 627, since Qiao '321 recited the motivation in the col. 6, lines 22-24 which achieve better bandwidth efficiency than shared path protection while having a much shorter backup segment, as well as a scalable algorithm.

However, the combined system (Pieds ' 627 – Qiao '321) are silent to disclosing calculating the minimum-cost restoration path for the new primary path using the specified set of links, wherein the cost of the minimum-cost restoration path is based on the sum of the cost of the links of the minimum-cost restoration path.

Doshi '875 discloses calculating the minimum-cost restoration path for the new primary path using the specified set of links, wherein the cost of the minimum-cost restoration path is based on the sum of the cost of the links of the minimum-cost restoration path (see figure 16B, step 356, assign demands to two routes with minimum capacity, using the one with least capacity for restoration, col. 30, lines 50-62, step 356, assigned to two routes with minimum capacity, using the route with the least capacity for restoration).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply calculating the minimum-cost restoration path for the new primary path using the specified set of links, wherein the cost of the minimum-cost restoration path is based on the sum of the cost of the links of the minimum-cost restoration path taught by Doshi '875 into the combined system (Pieds ' 627 – Qiao '321), since Doshi '875 recited the motivation in the col. 1, lines 23-25 which restoring communication in a network after a failure in link, span or node of the network, and more particular to restoration techniques in which restoration paths are pre computed at nodes distributed throughout the network.

Regarding to claim 23, Pieds ' 627 discloses the limitations of claim 20 above.

However, Pieds ' 627 are silent to disclosing the method is implemented for each of a set of candidate primary paths, wherein a path pair cost is generated for each candidate primary path as the sum of the path cost of the candidate primary path and the path cost of the corresponding minimum-cost restoration path; and the method further comprises selecting: i) candidate primary path from the set of candidate restoration paths and (ii) the corresponding minimum-cost restoration path that together have the lower path pair cost .

Doshi '875 discloses the method is implemented for each of a set of candidate primary paths, wherein a path pair cost is generated for each candidate primary path as the sum of the path cost of the candidate primary path and the path cost of the corresponding minimum-cost restoration path; and the method further comprises selecting: i) candidate primary path from the set of candidate restoration paths and (ii) the corresponding minimum-cost restoration path that together have the lower path pair cost (see col. 33, lines 14-20).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the method is implemented for each of a set of candidate primary paths, wherein a path pair cost is generated for each candidate primary path as the sum of the path cost of the candidate primary path and the path cost of the corresponding minimum-cost restoration path; and the method further comprises selecting: i) candidate primary path from the set of candidate restoration paths and (ii) the corresponding

minimum-cost restoration path that together have the lower path pair cost taught by Doshi '875 into the system of Pieds ' 627, since Doshi '875 recited the motivation in the col. 1, lines 23-25 which restoring communication in a network after a failure in link, span or node of the network, and more particular to restoration techniques in which restoration paths are pre computed at nodes distributed throughout the network.

7. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined system (Pieds ' 627 - Qiao '321 – Doshi '875) in view of Sinha (Patent No.: US 6,904,462 B1)

Regarding to claim 21, the combined system (Pieds ' 627 - Qiao '321 – Doshi '875) discloses the limitations of claim 20 above.

However, the combined system (Pieds ' 627 - Qiao '321 – Doshi '875) are silent to disclosing wherein the specified set of links excludes links in the network that are not SRLG-disjoint from the links of the new primary path, wherein: a shared risk group (SRLG) is a set of two or more links, for which a failure of any one link in the SRLG is associated with a relatively high risk of failure of the other links in the SRLG; and two links are SRLG-disjoint when they are not members of any one SRLG.

Sinha '462 discloses wherein the specified set of links excludes links in the network that are not SRLG-disjoint from the links of the new primary path, wherein: a shared risk group (SRLG) is a set of two or more links (col. 3, lines 65-67) , for which a failure of any one link in the SRLG is associated with a relatively high risk of failure of

the other links in the SRLG; and two links are SRLG-disjoint when they are not members of any one SRLG (col. 2, lines 50-55).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate wherein the specified set of links excludes links in the network that are not SRLG-disjoint from the links of the new primary path, wherein: a shared risk group (SRLG) is a set of two or more links, for which a failure of any one link in the SRLG is associated with a relatively high risk of failure of the other links in the SRLG; and two links are SRLG-disjoint when they are not members of any one SRLG taught by Sinha '462 into the combined system (Pieds ' 627 - Qiao '321 – Doshi '875). One would have motivated to do so to utilize minimum bandwidth usage is desirable to reduce cost of routing information at economy of scale (Sinha col. 1, line 35).

Regarding to claim 22, the combined system (Pieds ' 627 - Qiao '321 – Doshi '875) disclose the limitations of claim 20 above.

However, the combined system (Pieds ' 627 - Qiao '321 – Doshi '875) are silent to disclosing wherein the exclusion of links in the network that are not SRLG-disjoint from the links of the new primary path is accomplished by assigning an infinite initial cost to those links.

Sinha '462 discloses wherein the exclusion of links in the network that are not SRLG-disjoint from the links of the new primary path is accomplished by assigning an infinite initial cost to those links (col. 3, lines 63-64, col. 4, lines 12-15).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate wherein the exclusion of links in the network that are not SRLG-disjoint from the links of the new primary path is accomplished by assigning an infinite initial cost to those links taught by Sinha '462 into the combined system (Pieds ' 627 - Qiao '321 – Doshi '875). One would have motivated to do so to utilize minimum bandwidth usage is desirable to reduce cost of routing information at economy of scale (Sinha '462 col. 1, line 35).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 1-4, 8-12, 18, 19 are allowed.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claim 1 is allowed. Ishibashi et al. (2003/0147352) discloses a system for determining a restoration path corresponding to a primary path (301, 302) for a new service in a mesh network (page 1, [0004], multi-protocol label switching technology in a mesh network) having a plurality of nodes (figure 16, ABCDEF) interconnected by a plurality of links (figure 16, G1…G7), the system comprising:

For each link of a specified set of links in the network: (1) assigning an initial cost to the link (figure 16, page 11 [0148] the working path 302 has shared bandwidth of STS-3, the protection path 312 has shared bandwidth of STS-3); (2) determining whether the link's bandwidth can be shared with a new restoration path (shared bandwidth of protection path) for the new primary path ((shared bandwidth of working path).

Sinha (6904462) discloses calculating the minimum-cost restoration path for the new primary path using the specified set of links, wherein the cost of the minimum-cost restoration path is based on the sum of the cost of the links of the minimum-cost restoration path (see abstract, a path cost is determined for at least two protection paths based on a sum of link costs associated with a respective protection paths. One of the at least two protection paths having the minimum path cost is selected to provide protection for the working path).

Zang et al. (7,209,975) discloses reducing the link's cost when it is determined that the link's bandwidth can be shared with the new restoration path (col. 13, lines 30-32, the backup paths are rerouted to maximize backup resource sharing with respect to SRG constraints, and the working paths are rearranged to reduce the number of wavelengths-links that working path use).

The prior art however fails to disclose (iv) reducing the link cost by a factor R for each link of each candidate restoration path for which sharing is possible, wherein the factor R is a function of a sharing degree for each link; and

(v) when sharing is not possible, then:

(a) determining whether utilization of the link is greater than a specified threshold;

(b) when the link utilization is greater than the specified threshold, then assigning the link cost as a function of an administrative weight for the link and available capacity on the link; and

(c) when the link utilization is less than the specified threshold, then assigning the link cost as a function of the administrative weight for the link; and

(2) generating a path cost for the candidate restoration path based on a sum of the link costs for the links of that candidate restoration path; and

(B) selecting one of the candidate restoration paths for the primary path based on minimum path cost.

Claims 18 is allowed. The prior art failed to disclose (B) selecting the restoration path for the new service based on the path cost for each candidate restoration path, wherein the sharability of a link in a candidate restoration path is represented by a sharing degree for the link, wherein the sharing degree is a maximum number of additional unit-bandwidth primary services that can be added to the candidate primary path without increasing restoration bandwidth reserved on the link, wherein the sharing degree SD for a link is given by:

SD = the maximum value m for which max{ m'Vpnl -t- Vnla } = RB,

wherein:

Vp,,~ is a primary path node-link vector for the corresponding candidate primary path;

V~a is an aggregate node-link vector for the link; and

RB is current reservation bandwidth on the link.

Claim 19 is allowed. The prior art failed to disclose

(B) selecting the restoration path for the new service based on the path cost for each candidate restoration path, wherein the method is implemented for each of a plurality of

candidate primary paths to generate a path pair cost associated with the candidate primary path and further comprising selecting one of the candidate primary paths for the new service based on minimum path pair cost, wherein the plurality of candidate primary paths comprises:

K minimum-cost paths for the new service where the path cost of each candidate primary path is calculated as a function of the link costs of the links of the candidate primary path, and the link costs are calculated by:

(i) determining whether utilization of the link is greater than a specified threshold;

(ii) when the link utilization is greater than the specified threshold, then generating the link cost as a function of an administrative weight for the link and available capacity on the link;

and

(iii) when the link utilization is less than the specified threshold, then generating the link cost as a function of the administrative weight for the link.

10. Claim 25 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHUONG T. HO whose telephone number is (571)272-3133. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, EDAN ORGAD can be reached on (571) 272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ch.
05/06/09

/Edan Orgad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419